Dist-County-Route: 03-Yub-65
Post Mile Limits: 2.9/R4.7
Project Type: Maintenance
Project ID (EA): XXXXXX
Program Identification: 20.80.010.010
Phase: ☒ PID ☐ PA/ED ☐ PS&E

Regional Water Quality Control Board(s): Central Valley

1.	Does the project disturb 5 or more acres of soil?	Yes ☐	No ☒
2.	Does the project disturb more than 1 acre of soil and not qualify for the Rainfall Erosivity Waiver?	Yes ☐	No ☒
3.	Is the project required to implement Treatment BMPs?	Yes ☐	No ☒
4.	Does the project impact existing Treatment BMPs?	Yes ☐	No ☒

If the answer to any of the preceding questions is "Yes", prepare a Long Form – Stormwater Data Report. Unless otherwise agreed upon by the District/Regional Design Stormwater Coordinator.

Total Disturbed Soil Area: 0.0 New Impervious Surface: 0.0
Estimated Const. Start Date: 9/1/17 Estimated Const. Completion Date: 10/31/17
Risk Level: RL 1 ☐ RL 2 ☐ RL 3 ☐ Not Applicable ☒

This Short Form – Stormwater Data Report has been prepared under the direction of the following Licensed Person. The Licensed Person attests to the technical information contained herein and the data upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based. Professional Engineer or Landscape Architect stamp required at PS&E.

Betsy Ross 08/26/16

Betsy Ross, Registered Project Engineer/Landscape Architect *Date*

I have reviewed the stormwater quality design issues and find this report to be complete, current and accurate:

[Stamp Required at PS&E only]

Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben 08/26/16

Friedrich Vilhelm von Steuben, District/Regional Design SW Coordinator or Designee *Date*

1. Project Description

This is a fully funded roadway rehabilitation project located on State Route 65 (SR 65) near Wheatland in Yuba County. This job is estimated to begin construction in 2017. The limits are from PM 2.9 to R4.7. The approximate limits are from just north of Dairy Road to approximately 0.5 miles north of Rancho Road.

The existing road surface has deteriorated significantly. This project would replace asphalt concrete within the traveled way in order to preserve the structural section. Two alternatives are being considered, a no-build alternative a build alternative as described below.

No-build alternative: The no-build alternative provides a basis of comparison with the build alternative in the future analysis year of 2030. This No-Build Alternative would include all currently planned and programmed projects in this area through the year 2030.

Build alternative: The build alternative shall consist of the following activities:

- Perform digouts to repair failed pavement areas
- Cold plane to a maximum depth of 0.25 feet of the existing mainline asphalt surface
- Replace with hot mix asphalt
- Replace shoulder backing as required to match new pavement edge
- Replace existing striping and markings in kind
- Replace center line rumble strip and striping in kind

Because the no-build alternative has no effect on existing stormwater impacts, only the build alternative is discussed for the remainder of this report.

This project is defined as routine maintenance is therefore exempt from Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, CGP as noted in "Paragraph C. Activities Not Covered under the General Permit, 24. Routine maintenance to maintain original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, or original purpose of the facility".

The disturbed soil area for this routine maintenance project was not determined.

This project is located within the Yuba County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit area.

2. Site Data and Stormwater Quality Design Issues

Receiving water bodies for this project are in the undefined HSA (515.10). None these are on the 2012 Clean Water Act 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments or has a specified total maximum daily load.

A 401 Water Quality Certification is not anticipated.

3. Construction Site BMPs

This project is exempt from the Construction General Permit and associated risk assessment.

The only potential project pollutants are asphalt concrete (AC) grindings, striping paint, and miscellaneous non-stormwater pollutants the contractor may be using on-site.

This project will require a Water Pollution Control Program.

Erosion control is not anticipated. Only general housekeeping tasks are anticipated.

Project specific BMP measures will be specified and quantified during the design phase. Temporay construction BMPs have been estimated at 3.25% of the total project cost ($500,000) in accordance with the Project Initiation Cost Estimate Method, Appendix F.3.1, 2016 PPDG.

William Alexander was contacted on July 13, 2016. The Construction unit concurs with the Construction Site BMP development and strategy for this stage of the Project.

Required Attachments[1]

- Vicinity Map
- Evaluation Documentation Form
- SWDR Summary Spreadsheets

[1] Additional attachments may be required as applicable or directed by the District/Regional Design Storm Water Coordinator (e.g., BMP line item estimate, SW, DPP, and CS Checklists).

Vicinity Map

Evaluation Documentation Form

DATE: 08-26-13

Project ID (EA): 03-XXXXXX

No.	Criteria	Yes ✓	No ✓	Supplemental Information for Evaluation
1.	Begin Project evaluation regarding requirement for implementation of Treatment BMPs	✓		See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Treatment BMPs. Continue to 2.
2.	Is the scope of the Project to install Treatment BMPs (e.g., Alternative Compliance or TMDL Compliance Units)?		✓	If **Yes**, go to 8. If **No**, continue to 3.
3.	Is there a direct or indirect discharge to surface waters?	✓		If **Yes**, continue to 4. If **No**, go to 9.
4.	As defined in the WQAR or ED, does the project: a. discharge to areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS), or b. discharge to a TMDL watershed where Caltrans is named stakeholder, or c. have other pollution control requirements for surface waters within the project limits?		✓ ✓ ✓	If **Yes to any**, contact the District/Regional Design Stormwater Coordinator or District/Regional NPDES Coordinator to discuss the Department's obligations, go to 8 or 5. _____*(Dist./Reg. Coordinator initials)* If **No** to all, continue to 5.
5.	Are any existing Treatment BMPs partially or completely removed? (ATA condition #1, Section 4.4.1)		✓	If **Yes**, go to 8 **AND** continue to 6. If **No**, continue to 6.
6.	Is this a Routine Maintenance Project?	✓		If **Yes**, go to 9. If **No**, continue to 7.
7.	Does the project result in an increase of one acre or more of new impervious surface (NIS)?			If **Yes**, go to 8. If **No**, go to 9.
8.	Project is required to implement Treatment BMPs.	Complete Checklist T-1, Part 1.		
9.	Project is not required to implement Treatment BMPs. FWS *(Dist./Reg. Design SW Coord. Initials)* BR *(Project Engineer Initials)* 08/26/16 *(Date)*	Document for Project Files by completing this form and attaching it to the SWDR.		

See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Permanent Treatment BMPs

SWDR

SWDR Signed Date	District	EA/Project ID	County	Route	Beg_PM	End_PM	Project Description	Project Phase	Long SWDR	Risk Level	DSA (ac)	TMDL Waterbody
8/26/2016	3	XXXXXX	YUB	65	2.90		Maintenance	PID	No	WPCP	0.0	No

Biofiltration Strips and Swales	Detention	Infiltration Devices	GSRD	TST	MedFilter	DPPIA	SA	Other BMP	Est. Const_Start	Est. Const _Comp	SW Comment
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9/1/2017	10/31/2017	End_PM is R4.70

Post Const Treatment Area (ac)	Treated Impervious Area (ac)	Treated Impervious Area Balance (ac)	Treated Pervious Area (ac)	Stabilized Area (ac)	MWELO	RSA
0.00	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	0.00	No	No